



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1038/s41593-018-0143-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-018-0143-z)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Khan, A. G., Poort, J., Chadwick, A., Blot, A., Sahani, M., Masic-Flogel, T. D., & Hofer, S. B. (2018). Distinct learning-induced changes in stimulus selectivity and interactions of GABAergic interneuron classes in visual cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, 21(6), 851-859. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-018-0143-z>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# **Distinct learning-induced changes in stimulus selectivity and interactions of GABAergic interneuron classes in visual cortex**

Adil G. Khan<sup>1, 4\*†</sup>, Jasper Poort<sup>2\*†</sup>, Angus Chadwick<sup>3\*</sup>, Antonin Blot<sup>1\*</sup>, Maneesh Sahani<sup>3</sup>, Thomas D. Mrsic-Flogel<sup>1, 2†</sup>, Sonja B. Hofer<sup>1, 2†</sup>

1. Biozentrum, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

2. Sainsbury Wellcome Centre for Neural Circuits and Behaviour, University College London, London, UK

3. Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit, University College London, London, UK

4. Present address: Centre for Developmental Neurobiology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

\* Authors contributed equally

† Corresponding authors

Correspondence to: S.B.H. s.hofer@ucl.ac.uk, T.D.M-F. t.mrsic-flogel@ucl.ac.uk, A.G.K. khan.adil@kcl.ac.uk or J.P. j.poort@ucl.ac.uk

## **Summary**

**How learning enhances neural representations for behaviorally relevant stimuli via activity changes of cortical cell types remains unclear. We simultaneously imaged responses of pyramidal cells (PYR), and parvalbumin (PV), somatostatin (SOM), and vasoactive intestinal peptide (VIP) inhibitory interneurons in primary visual cortex while mice learned to discriminate visual patterns. Learning increased selectivity for task-relevant stimuli of PYR, PV and SOM subsets but not VIP cells. Strikingly, PV neurons became as selective as PYR cells, and their functional interactions reorganized leading to the emergence of stimulus-selective PYR-PV ensembles. Conversely, SOM activity became strongly decorrelated from the network, and PYR-SOM coupling before learning predicted selectivity increases in individual PYR cells. Thus, learning differentially shapes the activity and interactions of multiple cell classes; while SOM inhibition may gate selectivity changes, PV interneurons become recruited into stimulus-specific ensembles and provide more selective inhibition as the network becomes better at discriminating behaviorally relevant stimuli.**

## 31 **Introduction**

32 Learning exerts a powerful influence on how cortical circuits process sensory information.  
33 Cortical representations become more selective and better at discriminating sensory stimuli as  
34 they acquire behavioral relevance during learning<sup>1-5</sup>. These improvements in sensory coding  
35 take place in richly interconnected networks containing principal excitatory neurons as well as  
36 multiple classes of GABAergic interneurons, each with distinct molecular, cellular and  
37 connectional properties<sup>6,7</sup>. Yet how learning changes the responses and interactions of  
38 excitatory and inhibitory cell classes, and how these changes might relate to improvements in  
39 sensory coding, remains poorly understood.

40 Specific classes of inhibitory interneurons have been implicated in plasticity of cortical  
41 circuits during learning<sup>8-13</sup>. In principle, inhibitory neurons could gate the plasticity of inputs  
42 onto pyramidal cells<sup>14-18,11</sup> as well as inhibit or disinhibit their responses to specific sensory  
43 stimuli<sup>10-13,19</sup>. However, it is not known whether learning can enhance the response selectivity  
44 for behaviorally relevant stimuli in specific classes of interneurons and thus provide more  
45 stimulus-specific inhibition to the network. Moreover, each interneuron class has been  
46 suggested to act as a functionally (and thus computationally) homogeneous unit during  
47 sensory or behavioral events<sup>20-23,12,24</sup>, but it is not clear whether learning leads to  
48 homogeneous response changes within each interneuron class. Finally, due to the dense  
49 connectivity of cortical networks, any change in responses in one group of interneurons could  
50 lead to complex changes in responses of neurons belonging to other classes. However, only a  
51 few studies have measured or modeled activity of multiple cell classes concurrently<sup>25,24,19</sup>. As  
52 a result, the nature of interactions between different cell classes, and how they change with  
53 learning, remains poorly understood.

54 To address these questions, we imaged simultaneously the responses of four classes of  
55 cortical neurons: putative pyramidal cells (PYR), and parvalbumin (PV), somatostatin (SOM),  
56 and vasoactive intestinal peptide (VIP) expressing interneurons in layer 2/3 (L2/3) of the  
57 primary visual cortex (V1) before and after mice learned a visual discrimination task. In each  
58 cell class we observed heterogeneous responses to behaviorally relevant visual stimuli as well  
59 as diverse response changes with learning. Most strikingly, learning led to a pronounced  
60 increase in the stimulus selectivity of PV cells. A linear autoregressive system model revealed  
61 a reorganization of interactions between PYR and PV cells consistent with the emergence of  
62 stimulus specific PYR-PV subnetworks. In contrast, SOM cells became decorrelated from the  
63 local network during learning, and the degree of correlation with the SOM population before

64 learning predicted the extent of selectivity increase in PYR cells, suggesting that SOM cells  
65 gate response plasticity. These results reveal concerted changes in interactions between  
66 cortical cell classes during learning, and suggest differential roles of SOM and PV cells in  
67 induction and expression of response changes that lead to more selective processing of  
68 relevant stimuli.

## 69 **Results**

70 To understand how learning changes the responses of different cell types in V1, we trained  
71 mice to perform a visual discrimination task in a virtual reality environment<sup>5</sup> (**Fig. 1a**). Head-  
72 fixed mice learnt a go-no go discrimination task (**Fig. 1b**) in which they ran through a virtual  
73 approach corridor where the walls displayed a short stretch of circle patterns followed by gray  
74 for a random distance, before they were abruptly presented with one of two grating patterns.  
75 Mice were rewarded for licking a reward spout only in response to vertical gratings. No  
76 punishment was given for licking in response to angled gratings (40° relative to vertical). All  
77 mice learnt to discriminate the two stimuli, starting at chance performance (behavioral  $d'$   
78 close to zero) and reaching a threshold criterion of  $d' > 2.0$  within 9 days (~85% accuracy,  
79 **Fig. 1c**, sign test,  $P = 0.008$ ,  $N = 8$  mice).

80 We used viral vectors to express the calcium indicator GCaMP6f<sup>26</sup> in V1 and recorded  
81 responses of populations of L2/3 cells during the task before and after learning using two-  
82 photon calcium imaging. We then re-identified the same neurons in co-registered,  
83 immunohistochemically stained brain sections of the same animals and detected  
84 simultaneously imaged PV-positive, SOM-positive and VIP-positive interneurons<sup>27-29</sup> (**Fig.**  
85 **1d, Supplementary Fig. 1**). Immuno-unlabeled cells were classified as putative PYR cells<sup>30</sup>.

### 86 *Response heterogeneity within and across interneuron classes*

87 We first characterized the responses of the PYR, PV, SOM and VIP neurons while mice  
88 engaged in visual discrimination. The activity of many cells in each class was modulated by  
89 the onset of the task-relevant grating stimuli (**Fig. 1e, Supplementary Fig. 2a, b**). While on  
90 average VIP calcium signals peaked close to stimulus onset and decreased abruptly thereafter,  
91 the responses of PYR, PV and SOM cells typically increased after stimulus onset (**Fig. 1f,**  
92 **Supplementary Fig. 2c**). The average stimulus-triggered response profiles of PYR and PV  
93 cells were most similar to each other, while SOM and VIP cells exhibited opposing response  
94 profiles (**Fig. 1f, g, Supplementary Fig. 2c, d**).

Notably, responses of individual neurons within each cell class were highly heterogeneous, including stimulus-evoked increases and decreases in activity with diverse time-courses (**Fig. 1e, Supplementary Fig. 2a, b**). Within-class diversity was also apparent in responses triggered by the onset of running, and the delivery of reward or an odor (**Supplementary Fig. 3**). Thus, response profiles are broadly different between cell classes, but also heterogeneous within each cell class.

#### *Learning increases stimulus selectivity of specific cell classes*

During learning, the responses to task-relevant grating stimuli changed in subsets of neurons from all cell classes, including both increases and decreases in response amplitude (**Supplementary Fig. 4**), as well as changes in the average population response of each class (**Supplementary Fig. 4a, d**). These response changes modified stimulus selectivity in individual cells to varying degrees (difference in the responses to the vertical and angled grating stimuli normalized by response variability, see Online Methods, **Fig. 2a, b**). On average, PYR cells significantly increased their stimulus selectivity, as reported previously (average absolute selectivity pre-learning,  $0.31 \pm 0.32$  (mean  $\pm$  std), post-learning  $0.41 \pm 0.45$ , sign test,  $P < 10^{-7}$ ,  $N = 1249$ )<sup>5</sup>. Notably, selectivity also increased strongly in PV cells, in which calcium responses to the task-relevant stimuli became as selective as in PYR cells (**Fig. 2b-d, Supplementary Fig. 5a**; pre-learning  $0.25 \pm 0.20$ , post-learning  $0.43 \pm 0.38$ , sign test,  $P = 0.002$ ,  $N = 132$ ). Although on average the selectivity of SOM interneurons did not change significantly (pre-learning  $0.27 \pm 0.18$ , post-learning  $0.40 \pm 0.46$ ,  $P = 0.51$ ,  $N = 58$ ; **Fig. 2d**), 21% of SOM cells became significantly more selective during learning (**Fig. 2b, c**). In contrast, VIP cells were poorly responsive to and selective for the grating stimuli, and remained so after learning (pre-learning  $0.19 \pm 0.17$ , post-learning  $0.19 \pm 0.16$ ,  $P = 1.00$ ,  $N = 175$ ; **Fig. 2b-d**). Changes in eye position, pupil size, eye movements, running and licking could not account for the increased selectivity of responses after learning (**Supplementary Fig. 5b-i**). Furthermore, the increased response selectivity was specific to the task-relevant grating stimuli and was not observed in the approach corridor (**Supplementary Fig. 5j**).

To test whether differences across cell types in selectivity for task-relevant stimuli might have resulted from different nonlinearities in the relationship between a neuron's firing rate and calcium concentration, we performed loose-patch recordings of spiking activity while simultaneously imaging GCaMP6 calcium fluorescence in the three interneuron classes in visual cortex slices. We found a near-linear relationship between firing rate and the associated average calcium fluorescence changes in all interneuron classes (**Fig. 2e, Supplementary**

**Fig. 6**, PV = 13, SOM = 17 and VIP = 11 cells). The slope of this relationship was lower for PV cells than for SOM and VIP cells, possibly reflecting different calcium buffering capacities of these GABAergic populations<sup>31</sup>. The relationship between firing rate and fluorescence changes allowed us to infer the firing rates of imaged cells based on measured calcium transients on each trial. The selectivity values obtained from the inferred firing rate closely matched those obtained from calcium signals in each interneuron class (**Fig. 2f**). Thus, the observed changes in selectivity during learning were unlikely to arise from differences in calcium signal nonlinearities of the three interneuron classes.

The increased selectivity of PV cells for the grating stimuli was unexpected given that these interneurons are thought to broadly integrate the activity of surrounding PYR cells<sup>27,32–34</sup> (but see Wilson et. al.<sup>29</sup>), thus providing local inhibition proportional to the average local activity. Indeed, we observed a positive correlation between PV cell selectivity and the selectivity of average PYR cell activity (within 100  $\mu$ m from each PV cell) before learning (**Fig. 2g** top, slope = 0.2, confidence intervals (CI) 0.14 to 0.26, R = 0.49). However, the slope and correlation coefficient of this relationship decreased with learning (**Fig. 2g** bottom, slope = 0.05, CI 0.02 to 0.10, reduction in slope bootstrap test  $P < 10^{-4}$ , R = 0.26). Thus, the emergence of selective responses for behaviorally relevant stimuli in PV cells was associated with their activity becoming more independent from the average stimulus preference of the surrounding PYR cells. In contrast, the relationship between the selectivity of SOM cells and surrounding PYR cells remained constant with learning (**Fig. 2h**, slope before learning = 0.14, CI 0.04 to 0.24, R = 0.38, and after learning slope = 0.15, CI 0.05 to 0.25, R = 0.51,  $P > 0.05$ ).

#### *Learning reorganizes cell type-specific interactions*

These results suggest that improvements in response selectivity during learning are associated with a restructuring of firing interdependencies between different cell types in visual cortex. Specifically, PV cells might become more strongly influenced by external (top down or bottom up) inputs and driven less by surrounding PYR cells after learning. Alternatively, individual PV cells might acquire more selective input from subsets of PYR cells with specific stimulus-preferences during learning, leading them to respond more selectively. Both hypotheses predict a decreased dependence of PV firing on the average local network selectivity but with distinct changes in firing interdependencies between different cell types over learning. If a cell type were to decouple from the surrounding network and become more strongly influenced by non-local inputs, its co-fluctuations with neighboring cells would

decrease substantially. This would not be the case if a cell developed selective associations with neighboring cells of a given stimulus preference.

To distinguish between these hypotheses, we computed noise correlations during the grating stimulus period between pairs of neurons within and across cell classes, before and after learning (**Fig. 3, Supplementary Fig. 7**). Noise correlations reflect the stimulus-independent trial-to-trial covariability of responses (**Fig. 3a, b**), and thus provide an estimate of mutual connectivity and shared inputs<sup>35–37</sup>. We found that learning decreased noise correlations both within and between cell classes (sign test, all  $P$ s  $< 10^{-4}$ , with the exception of SOM-SOM cell pairs,  $P = 0.35$ ), indicating that firing in the network became more independent (**Fig. 3c**). Notably, the activity of SOM cells became strongly decorrelated from that of PYR, PV and VIP cells, while, in contrast, the firing of PV and VIP cells exhibited less decorrelation (**Fig. 3d**). Thus, the responses of SOM cells in particular became uncoupled from the local network during learning. Changes in eye position, pupil size, eye movements, running, licking, or reductions in response strength could not account for the observed changes in noise correlations (**Supplementary Fig. 8**). We further verified that our estimate of noise correlation was not strongly influenced by trial-to-trial variability in running speed, visual stimulus and eye position (**Supplementary Fig. 9**).

To what extent do modifications in functional interactions across cell types underlie changes in stimulus selectivity of individual neurons during learning? We fit a multivariate autoregressive (MVAR) linear dynamical system model (**Fig. 4a**) to the data, which predicted the activity of each cell based on two main components: (1) a contribution from the weighted activity of the simultaneously recorded population in the preceding time bin (the recurrent input), and (2) a contribution from a trial-invariant stimulus-locked input (the stimulus input). When the MVAR model is fit to the data, the interaction weights organize to best capture the covariance of the responses across the population, whereas the stimulus-related inputs adjust, given these interaction weights, to exactly replicate the average response profile of each cell (see Online Methods, **Fig. 4b**). The interaction weights should not be interpreted directly in terms of synaptic efficacies, but rather as effective influences over timescales of  $\sim 100$  ms, as determined by the imaging rate of 8 Hz.

We also included an input proportional to running speed in the model, but this had a negligible contribution to the responses (**Supplementary Fig. 10a**). Any remaining unexplained response variability was assigned to a residual term.

To test how accurately the data were captured by the MVAR model, we compared it to models with different forms of dynamics using cross validation. When tested on held-out data, the MVAR model outperformed both simpler models without interactions, as well as more complex models with time-varying interaction weights (**Supplementary Fig. 10b, c**, Online Methods). The interaction terms in the MVAR model were essential to capture the coherent trial-to-trial response fluctuations of neural activity in the data. Simulated network responses with all interaction weights deleted (set to zero, see Online Methods), led to average noise correlations that were substantially smaller than those in the experimental data (**Fig. 4c**, mean over all cells  $0.013 \pm 0.043$  from  $0.077 \pm 0.09$ , also **Supplementary Fig. 10d** for fit to pre-learning data) and the structure of pairwise noise correlations was re-organized entirely (**Fig. 4d** top, observed versus weights deleted:  $R^2 = -0.18$ ). By contrast, simulating responses with the residuals shuffled, thus eliminating residual coherent fluctuations *not* captured by the interaction weights (see Online Methods), had a negligible effect (**Fig. 4c**, mean over all cells  $0.058 \pm 0.07$  from  $0.077 \pm 0.09$ ; **Fig. 4d** bottom, observed versus residuals shuffled:  $R^2 = 0.59$ ).

Although the model was blind to cell type, we observed cell-class-specific differences in the interaction weights and their changes over learning (**Supplementary Fig. 10e**). Manipulating the interaction weights, which are determined only by the trial-to-trial fluctuations and independent of the mean response profiles (see Online Methods), allowed us to determine the extent to which the stimulus selectivity of different interneuron classes can be explained by functional interactions within the local network. We simulated the responses of the population with all interaction weights intact or deleted (**Fig. 4e, f**, see Online Methods). Before learning, deleting interaction weights led to a small but significant reduction in the absolute selectivity of PV and SOM cells (**Fig. 4e**; pre-learning P-values  $< 10^{-2}$ , sign test, see **Supplementary Fig. 11a** for effects of weight deletions on PYR and VIP cell selectivity). After learning, deleting interaction weights resulted in a larger reduction in selectivity of PV cells (**Fig. 4f**; post-learning  $P < 10^{-8}$ , sign test; change in slope between values with intact vs deleted weights after learning,  $P < 10^{-4}$ , bootstrap test). In contrast, SOM cell selectivity was not affected by weight deletion after learning (**Fig. 4f**, post-learning  $P = 0.51$ , sign test; slope comparison,  $P = 0.11$ , bootstrap test). Together, these results indicate that while PV selectivity becomes more dependent on local network interactions, the stimulus selectivity of SOM neurons becomes less dependent on the local network, consistent with the decorrelation of SOM responses during learning (**Fig. 3c**).



When manipulating inputs from different cell classes onto PV or SOM neurons, we found that specifically deleting PYR to PV interaction weights exerted a particularly strong effect on PV selectivity after learning (**Fig. 4g**, **Supplementary Fig. 11b**, pre- to post-learning change  $P = 0.02$ , sign test) while the effect of other cell-type specific weight deletions on selectivity did not change with learning for PV or SOM cells (**Fig. 4g, h**, all  $P$ -values pre- vs post-learning  $> 0.05$ , sign test). These results predict a reorganization of local PYR interaction weights onto PV cells in visual cortex during learning. Indeed, we found that after learning, PYR to PV interaction weights were significantly higher between cells that preferred the same grating stimulus compared to pairs of cells with disparate preferences for the task-relevant grating stimuli (**Fig. 4j**,  $P$ -values  $< 10^{-3}$ , Wilcoxon rank-sum test). In keeping with previous results<sup>35,37</sup>, PYR to PYR interaction weights already showed this functional specificity before learning, while no such differences were observed either pre- or post-learning for PYR to SOM weights (**Supplementary Fig. 11c**). However, similar to the weights from PYR to PV cells, PV to PYR and PV to PV interaction weights also diverged after learning between cell pairs with the same versus different visual stimulus preference (**Supplementary Fig. 11c**,  $P$ -values  $< 10^{-3}$ , Wilcoxon rank-sum test). Positive weights of inhibitory connections are expected at the sampling rate of our recordings (8Hz), as excitation and inhibition in cortical networks fluctuate coherently over longer timescales, with negative correlations emerging only at very short timescales of several milliseconds<sup>38,39</sup>. Thus, selective interactions between subsets of PV and PYR cells with similar stimulus preference developed during learning, consistent with the emergence of stimulus-selective PYR-PV subnetwork activity (**Fig. 4k**). Moreover, the model further revealed that stimulus-related inputs onto PV cells were not required to change during learning in order to account for their increased selectivity during learning (**Supplementary Fig. 11e**, Online Methods), indicating that the emergent preference of PV cells for task-relevant stimuli may be fully accounted for by changes in inputs from the local network.

Notably, the increased selectivity of PV cells may further contribute to PYR cell selectivity changes. Specifically, deletion of PV to PYR weights significantly reduced PYR selectivity, and this effect was greater after learning (**Fig. 4i**,  $P < 10^{-3}$ , sign test). In contrast, the effects of deleting SOM and PYR cell weights onto PYR cells did not change with learning ( $P$ -values  $> 0.05$ ). Taken together, these results indicate a key functional difference between PV and SOM interneurons. Post-learning, PV cells may integrate activity more selectively from local PYR cells and in turn provide more selective inhibition to the network after learning. In contrast, SOM cells appear to become uncoupled from the local network and might be influenced more

by external signals after learning.

### *Correlation with SOM cells predicts selectivity changes*

Pairing of top-down and bottom-up inputs arriving in apical and basal dendrites respectively is believed to be important for forming new associations<sup>40</sup>, and may contribute to increased stimulus selectivity of PYR cells during learning. As SOM cells preferentially target the dendrites of PYR cells they could gate the influence of top-down, task-related signals arriving in layer 1<sup>41,40,11,42</sup>. Those PYR cells that experience SOM mediated dendritic inhibition synchronous with bottom up stimulus-related drive may be prevented from pairing top down and bottom up inputs, and thus may not exhibit learning-related selectivity changes. We selected PYR cells that were highly correlated with the average SOM population activity before learning (top 20th percentile), and found that this subset of PYR cells showed very low selectivity increases during learning (**Fig. 5a**, right, **Fig. 5b**). Conversely, PYR cells that exhibited the lowest noise correlations with the SOM population (bottom 20th percentile) showed a significantly larger learning-induced increase in selectivity (**Fig. 5a**, left, **Fig. 5b**,  $P=0.001$  Wilcoxon rank-sum test. The result was similar when only including cells that were non-selective before learning,  $P = 0.039$ , see Online Methods). This dependence of changes in PYR cell selectivity on the extent of coupling with the SOM population was not apparent after learning ( $P = 0.4$ ), and neither could PYR, PV or VIP population coupling predict selectivity changes in PYR cells (**Fig. 5b**, all  $P$ -values pre- and post-learning  $> 0.2$ ). PV cells, which also significantly increased selectivity with learning, displayed no such relationship with SOM cell population activity (**Fig. 5c**, all  $P$ -values  $> 0.4$ ). Thus, the degree to which PYR neurons increase their selectivity during learning can be predicted from their correlation with the SOM cell population before learning.

## **Discussion**

Previous studies in various cortical areas have suggested that interneurons of a given molecularly defined class can act as a relatively homogenous functional unit during specific sensory or behavioral events, including high activity correlations between cells of the same class<sup>20–23,12,24,13</sup>. We found that activity correlations across cell classes (e.g. PV-VIP cell pairs) can be as high as those within a class (e.g. PV-PV, VIP-VIP pairs<sup>24</sup>). This implies that functional cell ensembles or subnetworks can span multiple cell types. Importantly, however, we observed a substantial within cell-class heterogeneity in responses aligned to onsets of

behaviorally relevant grating stimuli, running, reward and odor delivery, including response increases and decreases, as well as in learning-related response changes of PV, SOM and VIP interneurons in visual cortex. The fact that neurons within each cell class can be functionally diverse may not be surprising given that each molecularly defined class comprises cells with various morphologies, network connectivity and intrinsic properties<sup>6,43,7,44</sup>. The challenge for future studies is to establish the extent to which the heterogeneous behavior of single cells is captured by the diversity of cell types within an interneuron class and to determine any brain-state and region-specific differences in their activity.

We demonstrate that learning changes the selectivity and functional interactions of multiple classes of inhibitory interneurons in V1. Hence the relationship between neurons within and across cell classes and their contribution to network function is not static, but it can change with experience. We found that PV cells were poorly selective for task-relevant grating stimuli before learning. This is consistent with observations that PV cells, on average, broadly integrate inputs from their neighbors and therefore display broad visual stimulus tuning in mouse V1<sup>27,32–34</sup>. After learning, however, PV cells became selective and their tuning was less related to the preference of the average surrounding network of PYR cells. This result implies a rearrangement of interactions between PYR and PV cells, which were captured quantitatively by a linear dynamical system model. The model provided two significant insights. First, the origins of noise correlations in a neural network have been debated. Here we show that noise correlations can to a large extent be accounted for by the local functional interactions in a model with simple linear dynamics. Second, PYR to PV interaction weights became specific for stimulus preference during learning and significantly contributed to PV selectivity changes. Together, the model and data therefore suggest that learning induces plasticity in excitatory inputs onto PV cells, with stronger weights shared by cells preferring the same stimuli (note that the model cannot exclude the possibility that feedforward or feedback inputs onto PV cells also change during learning). This implies that PV cells can adjust which local excitatory inputs they sample subject to experience, leading to the emergence of PYR-PV ensembles selective for task-relevant stimuli. These effects were cell-class specific and not observed in interactions between PYR and SOM cells. Rather, SOM cells became decorrelated from other cell classes in the local network over the course of learning, and their response selectivity became less dependent on local interactions. Their activity during the task might therefore increasingly reflect signals from long-range inputs<sup>45,10</sup>. In the future, these insights could be tested directly by assessing the local and

long-range connectivity of PYR, PV and SOM neurons with specific response properties<sup>33,46</sup>  
in naive and expert mice.

Irrespective of its origin, the increased selectivity of PV cells implies an increase in the  
amount of selective inhibition in the local network, which may further sharpen cortical  
representations of task-relevant sensory stimuli<sup>47</sup>. In contrast, VIP cells remained unselective  
throughout learning, suggesting they do not play a direct role in shaping selective PYR cell  
responses after learning. This indicates that specific cell classes can be insulated from  
otherwise widespread network changes. VIP neurons may instead contribute to the  
decorrelation of SOM cell activity from the local network<sup>48,49,24,21</sup>

Dendrite-targeting SOM interneurons have been shown to be important for learning, and  
exhibit changes in their activity and bouton density in concert with learning-related changes  
in PYR cells<sup>50,11,10,12</sup>. We find that in naïve animals the degree of correlated activity with the  
SOM cell population predicts how strongly PYR neurons increase their selectivity during  
learning. Our results are consistent with the notion that SOM cells gate learning-related  
plasticity during the visual discrimination task by preventing the pairing of top-down and  
bottom-up inputs arriving in apical and basal dendrites respectively. Those PYR cells that  
receive highly correlated SOM inhibition are thus unable to increase their stimulus  
selectivity<sup>40,11,10</sup>. Conversely, low correlations with SOM cells were permissive of plasticity  
in PYR cells (**Fig. 5**). Indeed, the strong decorrelation of SOM cells from the rest of the  
network during learning may serve as a mechanism to increase plasticity of V1 circuits as  
visual stimuli become behaviorally relevant. Thus sensory cortical circuits may become  
primed to more readily undergo additional learning-related changes, for instance to facilitate  
further associations between visual stimuli and task-related signals.

Taken together, our results highlight the existence of functional diversity across and within  
three molecularly defined cell classes of interneurons. We find that learning-induced changes  
in cortical circuits are highly interdependent, involving interactions across multiple cell  
classes to enable more selective processing and increased discriminability of behaviorally  
relevant sensory stimuli.

### **Author contributions**

AGK, JP, TDMF and SBH designed the experiments. AGK and JP built the setup for imaging  
experiments in behaving mice, performed the experiments, and analyzed the data. AC

developed the MVAR model, performed the model-based data analysis and wrote the modeling results with supervision from MS and help from JP. AB performed the immunostaining and did the simultaneous calcium imaging and loose patch recordings. AB, AGK and JP established and performed the post-hoc cell matching procedure. AGK, JP, TDMF and SBH wrote the paper, with inputs from all authors.

## **Acknowledgments**

We thank P Znamenskiy and G Keller for discussions of the results in this manuscript. We thank A Keller for advice on the immunostaining protocol, and M Li for technical assistance. We thank the GENIE Program and Janelia Research Campus of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute for making GCaMP6 material available. This work was supported by the European Research Council (SBH, HigherVision 337797, TDM-F, NeuroV1sion 616509), the Swiss National Science Foundation (SBH, 31003A\_169525), the Marie Curie Actions of the European Union's FP7 program (JP, 332141 and AGK, 301742), an Ambizione grant from the SNSF (AGK), the UCL Excellence fellowship (JP), the EMBO long-term postdoc fellowship (AB), the Gatsby Charitable Foundation (MS), the Simons Foundation (MS, SCGB 323228, 543039) and Biozentrum core funds (University of Basel).

## **Competing interests**

The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests

## References

1. Recanzone, G. H., Schreiner, C. E. & Merzenich, M. M. Plasticity in the frequency representation of primary auditory cortex following discrimination training in adult owl monkeys. *J. Neurosci.* **13**, 87–103 (1993).
2. Schoups, A., Vogels, R., Qian, N. & Orban, G. Practising orientation identification improves orientation coding in V1 neurons. *Nature* **412**, 549–553 (2001).
3. Yang, T. & Maunsell, J. H. The effect of perceptual learning on neuronal responses in monkey visual area V4. *J. Neurosci.* **24**, 1617–1626 (2004).
4. Yan, Y. *et al.* Perceptual training continuously refines neuronal population codes in primary visual cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **17**, 1380–1387 (2014).
5. Poort, J. *et al.* Learning Enhances Sensory and Multiple Non-sensory Representations in Primary Visual Cortex. *Neuron* **86**, 1478–1490 (2015).
6. Markram, H. *et al.* Interneurons of the neocortical inhibitory system. *Nat.Rev.Neurosci.* **5**, 793–807 (2004).
7. Kepecs, A. & Fishell, G. Interneuron cell types are fit to function. *Nature* **505**, 318–326 (2014).
8. Letzkus, J. J. *et al.* A disinhibitory microcircuit for associative fear learning in the auditory cortex. *Nature* **480**, 331–335 (2011).
9. Donato, F., Rompani, S. B. & Caroni, P. Parvalbumin-expressing basket-cell network plasticity induced by experience regulates adult learning. *Nature* **504**, 272–276 (2013).
10. Makino, H. & Komiyama, T. Learning enhances the relative impact of top-down processing in the visual cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **18**, 1116–1122 (2015).
11. Chen, S. X., Kim, A. N., Peters, A. J. & Komiyama, T. Subtype-specific plasticity of inhibitory circuits in motor cortex during motor learning. *Nat. Neurosci.* **18**, 1109–1115 (2015).
12. Kato, H. K., Gillet, S. N. & Isaacson, J. S. Flexible Sensory Representations in Auditory Cortex Driven by Behavioral Relevance. *Neuron* **88**, 1027–1039 (2015).

- 401 13. Sachidhanandam, S., Sermet, B. S. & Petersen, C. C. H. Parvalbumin-Expressing GABAergic  
402 Neurons in Mouse Barrel Cortex Contribute to Gating a Goal-Directed Sensorimotor  
403 Transformation. *Cell Rep.* (2016). doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2016.03.063
- 404 14. Fagiolini, M. & Hensch, T. K. Inhibitory threshold for critical-period activation in primary visual  
405 cortex. *Nature* **404**, 183–186 (2000).
- 406 15. Froemke, R. C., Merzenich, M. M. & Schreiner, C. E. A synaptic memory trace for cortical  
407 receptive field plasticity. *Nature* **450**, 425–429 (2007).
- 408 16. Chen, J. L. *et al.* Structural basis for the role of inhibition in facilitating adult brain plasticity. *Nat.*  
409 *Neurosci.* **14**, 587–594 (2011).
- 410 17. van Versendaal, D. *et al.* Elimination of Inhibitory Synapses Is a Major Component of Adult Ocular  
411 Dominance Plasticity. *Neuron* **74**, 374–383 (2012).
- 412 18. Kuhlman, S. J. *et al.* A disinhibitory microcircuit initiates critical-period plasticity in the visual  
413 cortex. *Nature* **501**, 543–546 (2013).
- 414 19. Kuchibhotla, K. V. *et al.* Parallel processing by cortical inhibition enables context-dependent  
415 behavior. *Nat. Neurosci.* **20**, 62–71 (2017).
- 416 20. Kvitsiani, D. *et al.* Distinct behavioural and network correlates of two interneuron types in  
417 prefrontal cortex. *Nature* **498**, 363–366 (2013).
- 418 21. Pi, H.-J. *et al.* Cortical interneurons that specialize in disinhibitory control. *Nature* **503**, 521–524  
419 (2013).
- 420 22. Hangya, B., Pi, H.-J., Kvitsiani, D., Ranade, S. P. & Kepecs, A. From circuit motifs to computations:  
421 mapping the behavioral repertoire of cortical interneurons. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **26**, 117–124  
422 (2014).
- 423 23. Pinto, L. & Dan, Y. Cell-Type-Specific Activity in Prefrontal Cortex during Goal-Directed Behavior.  
424 *Neuron* **87**, 437–450 (2015).
- 425 24. Karnani, M. M. *et al.* Cooperative Subnetworks of Molecularly Similar Interneurons in Mouse  
426 Neocortex. *Neuron* **90**, 86–100 (2016).

- 427 25. Litwin-Kumar, A., Rosenbaum, R. & Doiron, B. Inhibitory stabilization and visual coding in cortical  
428 circuits with multiple interneuron subtypes. *J. Neurophysiol.* jn.00732.2015 (2016).  
429 doi:10.1152/jn.00732.2015
- 430 26. Chen, T.-W. *et al.* Ultrasensitive fluorescent proteins for imaging neuronal activity. *Nature* **499**,  
431 295–300 (2013).
- 432 27. Kerlin, A. M., Andermann, M. L., Berezovskii, V. K. & Reid, R. C. Broadly tuned response  
433 properties of diverse inhibitory neuron subtypes in mouse visual cortex. *Neuron* **67**, 858–871  
434 (2010).
- 435 28. Keller, A. J. & Martin, K. A. C. Local Circuits for Contrast Normalization and Adaptation  
436 Investigated with Two-Photon Imaging in Cat Primary Visual Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 10078–  
437 10087 (2015).
- 438 29. Wilson, D. E. *et al.* GABAergic Neurons in Ferret Visual Cortex Participate in Functionally Specific  
439 Networks. *Neuron* **93**, 1058–1065.e4 (2017).
- 440 30. Rudy, B., Fishell, G., Lee, S. & Hjerling-Leffler, J. Three groups of interneurons account for nearly  
441 100% of neocortical GABAergic neurons. *Dev. Neurobiol.* **71**, 45–61 (2011).
- 442 31. Hu, H., Gan, J. & Jonas, P. Fast-spiking, parvalbumin+ GABAergic interneurons: From cellular  
443 design to microcircuit function. *Science* **345**, 1255263 (2014).
- 444 32. Bock, D. D. *et al.* Network anatomy and in vivo physiology of visual cortical neurons. *Nature* **471**,  
445 177–182 (2011).
- 446 33. Hofer, S. B. *et al.* Differential connectivity and response dynamics of excitatory and inhibitory  
447 neurons in visual cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **14**, 1045–1052 (2011).
- 448 34. Scholl, B., Pattadkal, J. J., Dilly, G. A., Priebe, N. J. & Zemelman, B. V. Local Integration Accounts  
449 for Weak Selectivity of Mouse Neocortical Parvalbumin Interneurons. *Neuron* **87**, 424–436  
450 (2015).
- 451 35. Ko, H. *et al.* Functional specificity of local synaptic connections in neocortical networks. *Nature*  
452 **473**, 87–91 (2011).



- 453 36. Cohen, M. R. & Kohn, A. Measuring and interpreting neuronal correlations. *Nat. Neurosci.* **14**,  
454 811–819 (2011).
- 455 37. Cossell, L. *et al.* Functional organization of excitatory synaptic strength in primary visual cortex.  
456 *Nature* **518**, 399–403 (2015).
- 457 38. Tsodyks, M. V., Skaggs, W. E., Sejnowski, T. J. & McNaughton, B. L. Paradoxical Effects of External  
458 Modulation of Inhibitory Interneurons. *J. Neurosci.* **17**, 4382–4388 (1997).
- 459 39. Ozeki, H., Finn, I. M., Schaffer, E. S., Miller, K. D. & Ferster, D. Inhibitory Stabilization of the  
460 Cortical Network Underlies Visual Surround Suppression. *Neuron* **62**, 578–592 (2009).
- 461 40. Larkum, M. A cellular mechanism for cortical associations: an organizing principle for the  
462 cerebral cortex. *Trends Neurosci.* **36**, 141–151 (2013).
- 463 41. Silberberg, G. & Markram, H. Disynaptic inhibition between neocortical pyramidal cells mediated  
464 by Martinotti cells. *Neuron* **53**, 735–746 (2007).
- 465 42. Takahashi, N., Oertner, T. G., Hegemann, P. & Larkum, M. E. Active cortical dendrites modulate  
466 perception. *Science* **354**, 1587–1590 (2016).
- 467 43. Runyan, C. A. & Sur, M. Response Selectivity Is Correlated to Dendritic Structure in Parvalbumin-  
468 Expressing Inhibitory Neurons in Visual Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 11724–11733 (2013).
- 469 44. Jiang, X. *et al.* Principles of connectivity among morphologically defined cell types in adult  
470 neocortex. *Science* **350**, aac9462 (2015).
- 471 45. Zhang, S. *et al.* Selective attention. Long-range and local circuits for top-down modulation of  
472 visual cortex processing. *Science* **345**, 660–665 (2014).
- 473 46. Wertz, A. *et al.* Single-cell-initiated monosynaptic tracing reveals layer-specific cortical network  
474 modules. *Science* **349**, 70–74 (2015).
- 475 47. Harris, K. D. & Mrsic-Flogel, T. D. Cortical connectivity and sensory coding. *Nature* **503**, 51–58  
476 (2013).
- 477 48. Pfeffer, C. K., Xue, M., He, M., Huang, Z. J. & Scanziani, M. Inhibition of inhibition in visual cortex:  
478 the logic of connections between molecularly distinct interneurons. *Nat. Neurosci.* **16**, 1068–  
479 1076 (2013).

- 480 49. Lee, S., Kruglikov, I., Huang, Z. J., Fishell, G. & Rudy, B. A disinhibitory circuit mediates motor  
481 integration in the somatosensory cortex. *Nat. Neurosci.* **16**, 1662–1670 (2013).
- 482 50. Cichon, J. & Gan, W.-B. Branch-specific dendritic Ca<sup>2+</sup> spikes cause persistent synaptic plasticity.  
483 *Nature* **520**, 180–185 (2015).
- 484

## Online Methods

Experimental procedures for the behavioral task, surgery and two-photon calcium imaging have been described in detail in a previous study<sup>5</sup>.

### *Animals and two-photon calcium imaging*

All experimental procedures were carried out in accordance with institutional animal welfare guidelines and licensed by the Swiss cantonal veterinary office. Mice used in this study were C57Bl/6 wild type mice (3 males, 1 female, Janvier Labs), crosses between Rosa-CAG-LSL-tdTomato (JAX: 007914) and PV-Cre (JAX: 008069) (2 males), and crosses between Rosa-CAG-LSL-tdTomato and VIP-Cre (JAX: 010908) (1 male, 1 female) all obtained from Jackson Laboratory. Mice aged between postnatal days 48-58 were implanted with a chronic imaging window following viral injections of AAV2.1-syn-GCaMP6-WPRE<sup>26</sup>. Imaging began approximately three weeks after surgery using a custom-built resonant scanning two-photon microscope. Images of  $750 \times 750$  pixels and a field of view of  $350 \mu\text{m} \times 350 \mu\text{m}$  were acquired with an imaging rate of 32 Hz. We used a piezo Z-scanner (P-726.1CD, Physik Instrumente) to scan 4 planes with  $20 \mu\text{m}$  spacing, resulting in an imaging rate of 8 Hz for each imaging plane. We imaged 8 mice both pre-learning (either first or second day of training) and post-learning (either day 7, 8 or 9 of training). Before each recording session the same imaging site was found by matching anatomical land marks. Mice with bone re-growth under the window, or poor viral expression were excluded from the study.

### *Behavioral training and discrimination task*

Details of the behavioural task have been described in a previous study<sup>5</sup>. Mice were trained in a visual discrimination task as they ran on a styrofoam wheel through a virtual corridor over 9 days. Mice were food deprived to maintain at least 85% of their free-feeding body weight (typically 85-90%). A trial began by displaying black and white circles on the walls of the virtual corridor for a short distance (111 cm), followed by a random distance of gray walls (minimum 74-185 cm, additional random delay chosen from an exponential distribution with mean 37 cm). Mice were then randomly teleported to one of two grating corridors (length 111 cm) with either a vertical grating pattern (square wave gratings, 100% contrast) or an angled grating pattern (rotated  $40^\circ$  relative to vertical) on the walls. Mice were rewarded with a drop of soy milk for licking a reward spout in response to the vertical grating (hits), whereas one or more licks in the angled grating corridor were considered errors (false alarms). We quantified the performance of the mouse using a behavioral d-prime:  $bd' = \Phi^{-1}(H) - \Phi^{-1}(F)$ , where  $\Phi^{-1}$  is the normal inverse cumulative distribution function, H is the rate of hit trials and F is the

rate of false alarm trials. Mice were also trained in a similarly structured olfactory discrimination task in the dark where odour 1 (10% soya milk odor) was rewarded and odour 2 (10% soya milk with 0.1% limonene mixture) was not rewarded.

#### *Immunohistochemistry and image registration*

Brains were fixed by transcardial perfusion with 4 % paraformaldehyde in phosphate buffer 0.1 M followed by 24 hours of post-fixation in the same solution at 4°C. The whole brains were incubated successively in 20 ml of 10 %, 20 % and 30 % sucrose in phosphate buffer saline (PBS) at 4°C for 1, 8 and 12 hours respectively. For antigen retrieval, the brains underwent two freeze-thaw cycles in liquid nitrogen, followed by three 10 minute washes in PBS. The brains were then sliced tangentially to the surface of visual cortex. 80 µm slices were cut on a vibratome (Zeiss Hydrax V50) and washed three times for 10 minutes each in PBS.

Slices were blocked overnight at room temperature with blocking buffer (Triton X-100 2 %, goat serum 10 %, NaN<sub>3</sub> 0.04 % in PBS), incubated in primary antibodies in blocking buffer for twelve hours at room temperature and 2.5 days at 4°C, rinsed three times for one minute and three times for ten minutes in PBS and finally incubated in secondary antibodies in blocking buffer for one day at room temperature. Slices were then rinsed three times for one minute and three times for ten minutes in PBS before being mounted on slides in DABCO-PVA (2.5 % DABCO, 10 % polyvinyl alcohol (Sigma; Type II), 5 % glycerol and 25 mM Tris buffer at pH 8.7). Primary and secondary antibodies were applied in blocking buffer, and are listed in **Supplementary Table 1**.

The slices were imaged with a confocal microscope (Zeiss LSM 700), and confocal z-stacks were compared with the previously acquired in vivo imaging planes and z-stacks of the recording sites<sup>27,28</sup>. We determined the approximate location of the injection site using GCaMP6 fluorescence, and then used blood vessel patterns and cellular morphology to identify the imaging site. We matched at least three points in the confocal z-stack to points in the in vivo imaging plane to obtain a 3-dimensional transformation matrix which was applied to the entire confocal z-stack. Cells were then manually identified and assigned to cell classes based on immunostaining.

To measure the overlap of labelling by transgenic mouse lines and immunostaining, we performed immunostaining on PV, SOM, and VIP transgenic mice (2 mice each) expressing tdTomato in the respective interneuron class, and determined the percentage of overlap between immunostaining and transgenic marker expression, which in each case was above

90% (**Supplementary Table 2a**). We further measured the percentage of transgenically labelled cells that were also identified as belonging to the same interneuron class by immunostaining (**Supplementary Table 2b**). These values give an upper bound on the number of false negatives (interneurons that could not be classified as such due to insufficient immuno-labelling; PV = 7.4%; SOM = 29.9%; VIP = 14.6%). The values for SOM cells may be influenced by the fact that in the SOM-CRE line 6-10% of CRE-positive cells have been reported to be PV interneurons<sup>51</sup>.

#### *Simultaneous loose patch and fluorescence measurements*

Crosses between PV-Cre (JAX: 008069) and Rosa-CAG-LSL-tdTomato (JAX: 007914) (4 males) were injected with GCaMP6f expressing AAV virus (AAV1.Syn.GCaMP6f.WPRE, vector core, University of Pennsylvania Gene Therapy Program) and VIP-Cre (JAX: 010908, 3 males) or SOM-Cre (JAX: 013044, 3 females) mice were injected with AAV1.Syn.Flex.GCaMP6f.WPRE.SV40, (vector core, University of Pennsylvania Gene Therapy Program) in V1 at P27-P40. After 9-16 days, animals were anesthetized with pentobarbital (150mg/kg), and brains were intracardially perfused by ice cold Choline Chloride solution containing 110 mM Choline chloride, 11.60 mM Na-ascorbate, 7 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 3.10 mM Na-Pyruvate, 2.5 mM KCl, 1.25 mM NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 25 mM NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, and 25 mM D-Glucose bubbled with a 5% CO<sub>2</sub>, 95% O<sub>2</sub> mixture. Coronal slices of cortex (350  $\mu$ m) were cut in the same Choline chloride solution using a VT1200S vibratome (Leica). After 30 minutes at 32 degrees in ACSF containing 125 mM NaCl, 2.5 mM KCl, 1.25 mM NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 26 mM NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, 2 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 1 mM CaCl<sub>2</sub>, 25 mM D-Glucose bubbled with a 5% CO<sub>2</sub>, 95% O<sub>2</sub> mixture, slices were brought to room temperature.

Loose patch recordings were performed at 32 degrees in ACSF. Pipettes (5-7 M $\Omega$ ) filled with 5 mM KCl, 115 mM K-gluconate, 10 mM K-HEPES, 4 mM MgATP, 0.3 mM NaGTP, 10 mM Na-phosphocreatine, 0.1% w/v biocytin were lowered in the bath. Fluorescent cells were targeted for loose-cell patch clamp recordings (seal > 50 M $\Omega$ ). To induce activity in otherwise quiet slices, a second glass pipette with a potassium-based solution was placed above the recorded cell and slight positive pressure was applied to trigger activity in the recorded neuron. This pipette contained a mixture of internal solution and a diluting solution in 3:7 ratio. The diluting solution contained 150 mM NaCl, 2.5 mM KCl and 10 mM Hepes (final potassium concentration 48 mM). Electrophysiological signals were acquired using a Multiclamp 700B (Axon instruments) filtered between 1 Hz to 2 KHz and digitized at 20 KHz with a NI-PCI6229 (National Instruments) and acquired with WinWCP (John Dempster,

University of Strathclyde). Extracellular spikes were detected using custom Python scripts. Simultaneous two-photon imaging was performed at 34 Hz frame rate using a custom-built two-photon microscope at a wavelength of 940 nm, through a 16× water immersion objective (0.8 NA, Nikon).

#### *Data analysis*

Image stacks were corrected for motion and regions of interest (ROIs) were selected for each cell in each session. Raw fluorescence time series  $F(t)$  were obtained for each cell by averaging across pixels within each ROI. Baseline fluorescence  $F_0(t)$  was computed by smoothing  $F(t)$  (causal moving average of 0.375s) and determining for each time point the minimum value in the preceding 600s time window (120s for slice experiments). The change in fluorescence relative to baseline,  $\Delta F/F$ , was computed by taking the difference between  $F$  and  $F_0$ , and dividing by  $F_0$ . To test the influence of out-of-focus fluorescence from the neuropil surrounding cell body ROIs on neuronal responses of the different cell classes and learning-related changes, we repeated the key analyses after adapting the method of <sup>26</sup> to correct for neuropil contamination of calcium traces (**Supplementary Fig. 12**). We created for each cell a neuropil mask by extending the ROI by 25μm and taking all pixels that were more than 10μm away from the cell boundary, excluding pixels assigned to other cells. In order to avoid including segments of dendrites and axons in the neuropil mask, we computed for each pixel the average fluorescence across all frames, and excluded pixels that were more than 2 standard deviations brighter than the mean across all pixels in the neuropil mask. We performed a robust regression on the relationship between the fluorescence values of the ROI and neuropil mask. By inspecting the slope of this regression in a sample of our dataset we obtained a factor of 0.7 by which we multiplied the neuropil mask fluorescence before subtracting it from the ROI fluorescence.

Responses were analyzed separately for the vertical and angled grating corridor by aligning neuronal activity to the onset of the grating corridors. We used a Wilcoxon rank-sum test to determine if the response of a cell (average  $\Delta F/F$  in a time window of 0-1 s after grating onset) was significantly different for vertical and angled gratings ( $P < 0.05$ ). Within stimulus conditions, we used a Wilcoxon signed-rank test to determine if the response ( $\Delta F/F$  0-1 s) to the gratings significantly increased or decreased relative to baseline (-0.5 to 0 s). For visualizing stimulus-evoked responses (**Fig. 1e, Supplementary Fig. 2a, b, 3, 4b, e**), and for computing the change in stimulus-evoked responses with learning (**Supplementary Fig. 4c**,

f), we subtracted the pre-stimulus baseline (-0.5 to 0 s before stimulus onset) from the average response.

We quantified the selectivity of each cell as the selectivity index (SI) which was the difference between the mean response (0-1 s) to the vertical and angled grating divided by the pooled standard deviation. The selectivity was positive for cells that preferred the vertical grating and negative for cells that preferred the angled grating. To determine the significance of changes in the SI with learning of single cells (**Fig. 2c**), we used a bootstrap procedure. We randomly selected for every pre-learning session trials with replacement 1000 times and compute the SI to obtain the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of the pre-learning selectivity. An increase or decrease in the SI was considered significant if the post learning selectivity was outside this interval. To obtain an average measure of the selectivity across a population of cells including vertical and angled preferring cells, we took the average of the absolute selectivity of all cells (**Fig. 2d, Supplementary Fig. 5e-j, 12a**). We calculated the selectivity of the local PYR population around each interneuron by averaging the responses of all PYR cells within 100  $\mu$ m distance, to the two grating stimuli (**Fig. 2g, h, Supplementary Fig. 12b**). We calculated the confidence intervals for the slope in these figures by a bootstrap procedure where we randomly selected cells with replacement 10,000 times to obtain the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles. The P value was given by the percentage of bootstrapped pre-learning slope values that were lower than the post-learning slope multiplied by two (two-sided test). To compute  $\Delta$ selectivity, we subtracted the absolute selectivity with weights intact from the absolute selectivity with weights deleted (**Fig. 4e-i**), or we subtracted the absolute selectivity before learning from the absolute selectivity after learning (**Fig. 5b, c**).

We used the Pearson correlation coefficient to quantify the correlation between responses of pairs of cells. The significance of the correlation coefficient was determined using Student's t-distribution. Noise correlation was computed by first subtracting for each trial and each cell the average responses across all trials. Changes in noise correlations with learning between different cell types (**Fig. 3c**) were tested using a sign test with Bonferroni correction on all cells imaged pre- and post-learning. Noise correlation with a population (population coupling, **Fig. 5**) was computed by averaging the activity of all cells belonging to a specific cell class in a given recording (the population activity) and calculating the noise correlation of an individual cell with this population activity of a given cell class as above. Correlations from the two grating stimulus conditions were averaged. To establish that the difference in  $\Delta$ selectivity of PYR cells that strongly or weakly correlated with the SOM population (**Fig. 5b**) was not due to any differences in the selectivity of the selected cells pre learning, we

repeated the analysis including only cells that were non-selective pre learning (N = 152 cells in each group). Cells were classified as non-selective if their responses to the two grating stimuli in a time window of 1s after grating onset were not significantly different (Wilcoxon rank-sum test,  $P > 0.05$ ).

We quantified differences between response profiles across cell classes by using a random forest decoder that classified cells to one of two classes based on the shape of the baseline-subtracted response, averaged across all trials (**Fig. 1g, Supplementary Fig. 2d**). For a given pair of cell classes, we randomly picked 20 cells of each class to train the decoder (Matlab function `TreeBagger`, with parameters  $N_{\text{trees}} = 32$ ,  $\text{minleaf} = 5$ ), and estimated the accuracy of classifying the cells of each class that were not used for training. We repeated this procedure 1000 times for each pair of cell classes and averaged the accuracies to obtain the classification accuracy. In order to estimate the baseline classification accuracy, we randomly picked two sets of 20 cells from the same class to train the decoder. We used the classification accuracy (CA) to compute the similarity score  $SS = 2 \cdot (1 - CA)$ , where scores near 0 and 1 indicate low and high response profile similarity between two cell classes respectively.

We controlled for the possible effect of variations across learning in running speed, eye position, pupil radius, and occurrences of eye movements and licking on selectivity and correlations, by using a stratification approach<sup>5</sup>. We selected a subset of trials with similar distributions of eye position, pupil radius or running speed before and after learning. We then recomputed the selectivity and noise correlations before and after learning and obtained similar results with and without stratification (**Supplementary Figs. 5d, e, h, 8a, b, e**). We also used a stratification approach to determine whether the reduction in noise correlation could be explained by a reduction in response strength with learning. For every cell pair where one (or both) of the two cells showed a significant decrease in response strength with learning, we selected a subset of trials with similar distribution(s) of response strength before and after learning. After recomputing the noise correlations, we observed similar results (**Supplementary Fig. 8f**). Before learning, mice licked with a mean latency of 3.14 s (median 1.06 s) and after learning the mean lick latency was 2.32 s (median 1.59 s) relative to stimulus onset. Therefore, in most trials mice licked only after the analysis window. Furthermore, on excluding trials with licks or eye movements in the analysis window we obtained similar results (**Supplementary Figs. 5f, g, 8c, d**). To determine the contribution of variations in running speed and eye position to the strength of noise correlations, we compared noise correlations computed on a subset of trials with reduced variability to noise correlations



computed on a random subset. More specifically, for every post learning session we computed the average running speed for each trial (0-1 s after grating onset). We then picked trials from the middle 50% of this distribution (25th to 75th percentile) and picked an equal number of trials sampled randomly from the full distribution. We repeated the random selection 10 times and took the average noise correlations. Noise correlations obtained for the middle 50% and random selection were very similar, both for individual cells (**Supplementary Fig. 9a**), and for the average noise correlations between specific cell classes (**Supplementary Fig. 9b**). We also performed a similar analysis for the horizontal eye position after computing the average eye position for each trial (0-1 s after grating onset) (**Supplementary Fig. 9c, d**). The task-irrelevant patterns of white and black circles on the walls at the beginning of the approach corridor evoke robust and selective neural responses (see Poort et al., Neuron 2015, Figure S7). As described previously, we computed the selectivity of responses by comparing the response strength at different corridor locations (the length of the corridor section with black and white circles was 111 cm, divided into 60 position bins). More specifically, selectivity was calculated as the standard deviation of the mean response across positions  $S_R$  divided by the pooled standard deviation across positions:  $(2 \cdot S_R)/S_p^{pos}$ , where  $S_p^{pos} = \sum_{i=1}^{k=N_{pos}} (n_i - 1) s_i^2 / \sum_{i=1}^k (n_i - 1)$  and  $N_{pos}$  is the number of position bins<sup>5</sup>.

We performed statistical tests which included information about the nesting of cells within animals with a linear mixed-effects model (Matlab function fitlme). The analysis in **Fig. 2d** was repeated using a linear mixed-effects model with a fixed effect for learning stage and a random effect for cell identity (nested within animals), which returned similar results to those reported above (P-values for PYR, PV, SOM and VIP cells respectively:  $P < 10^{-16}$ ,  $P < 10^{-6}$ ,  $P = 0.023$ ,  $P = 0.92$ ). We also repeated the same analysis after controlling for eye position, pupil size, eye movements, running and licking (**Supplementary Fig. 5b-i**) using a linear mixed-effects model with a fixed effect for learning stage and a random effect for cell identity (nested within animals), which returned similar results to those reported (P-values for PYR, PV, SOM and VIP cells respectively:  $P < 10^{-15}$ ,  $P < 10^{-6}$ ,  $P = 0.002$ ,  $P = 0.04$  (eye position),  $P < 10^{-7}$ ,  $P < 10^{-4}$ ,  $P = 0.40$ ,  $P = 0.002$  (pupil size),  $P < 10^{-14}$ ,  $P < 10^{-4}$ ,  $P = 0.25$ ,  $P = 0.30$  (eye movements),  $P < 10^{-10}$ ,  $P < 10^{-4}$ ,  $P = 0.003$ ,  $P = 0.26$  (running speed),  $P < 10^{-5}$ ,  $P < 10^{-5}$ ,  $P = 0.08$ ,  $P = 0.03$  (licking). We also repeated the analysis in **Supplementary Fig. 5j** using a linear mixed-effects model with a fixed effect for learning stage and a random effect for cell identity (nested within animals), which returned similar P-values for PYR, PV, SOM and VIP cells respectively:  $P < 10^{-16}$ ,  $P = 0.002$ ,  $P = 0.009$ ,  $P = 0.007$ ). The analysis in **Fig. 2g, h** was

repeated with a linear mixed-effects model with the selectivity of PV or SOM as fixed effect and cell identity (nested within animals) as random effect, which also returned similar results and confidence intervals as those reported above (PV, slope before learning 0.20, CI 0.14 to 0.26, after learning 0.05, CI 0.02 to 0.09, SOM slope before learning 0.14, CI 0.05 to 0.23, after learning 0.15, CI 0.08 to 0.22). The analysis in **Fig. 3c** was repeated using the linear mixed-effects model with a fixed effect for learning stage and a random effect for cell identity (nested within animals) also resulting in similar P-values (all  $P_s < 10^{-4}$ , with the exception of SOM-SOM cell pairs,  $P = 0.87$ ). Finally, the analysis in **Fig. 5** was repeated using the linear mixed-effects model with a fixed effect for correlation category and a random effect for animal identity also resulting in similar P-values (all  $P_s > 0.05$ , with the exception of pre-learning PYR-SOM coupling,  $P < 10^{-3}$ ).

#### *Linear Multivariate Autoregressive System Model*

We modeled the activity of the simultaneously imaged neurons using a multivariate autoregressive (MVAR) linear dynamical system incorporating stimulus-related input. The MVAR model takes advantage of the simultaneously measured co-fluctuations from multiple cells of different cell types before and after learning to estimate the interaction weights between pairs of cells. The interaction weights describe the relationship between the activity of one cell and the activity of another cell at previous timepoints, conditioned over the activity of all other cells and over behavioral and sensory variability, thereby being more causal in nature and going beyond measures such as simple correlation. For each imaging session, we extracted the  $\Delta F/F$  signals from all  $N_{\text{neuron}}$  neurons in  $N$  trials, each spanning  $-1$  to  $1$  s (in timesteps  $t = 0 \dots T$ ) relative to the onset of a grating stimulus (stimulus label  $s = 1, 2$  for vertical and angled gratings respectively) or to the onset of the gray pre-stimulus period ( $s = 0$ ), and collected the measured activity of all neurons in the population at time sample  $t$  of trial  $i$  into a vector  $\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)}$ . The change in this vector at time  $t$  was modeled as depending linearly on the preceding population activity vector through an interaction matrix  $A$ , on the stimulus through a time-dependent input vector  $\mathbf{u}_t^{(s)}$  (common to all trials with the same stimulus), and on the instantaneous running speed of the animal  $v_t^{(i)}$  through a weight vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ . This gave the model:

$$\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} = \mathbf{r}_{t-1}^{(i)} + A\mathbf{r}_{t-1}^{(i)} + \mathbf{u}_t^{(s)} + \boldsymbol{\xi}v_t^{(i)} + \mathbf{e}_t^{(i)} \quad (1)$$

747 where  $\mathbf{e}_t^{(i)}$  represents a residual term capturing the activity unexplained by the other factors.  
 748 We fit the parameters  $A$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_t^{(s)}$  (for  $s = 0, 1, 2$  and all times  $t$  in the trial), and  $\xi$  by minimizing  
 749 the sum of squared residuals over all trials  $i$  and time samples  $t$ . Model fitting was blind to  
 750 cell type.

751 The least-squares fit parameters could be found analytically, and the corresponding forms are  
 752 instructive regarding the relationship between parameters and properties of the data. For  
 753 simplicity we neglect the velocity-related term in the following equations. Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)}$  be the  
 754 average population activity vector at time sample  $t$  on trials where stimulus  $s$  was presented:

755  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)} = \frac{1}{N^{(s)}} \sum_{i:\text{stim}(i)=s} \mathbf{r}_t^{(i)}$ , where the sum is over trials with stimulus  $s$  and  $N^{(s)}$  is the

756 number of such trials. We define sample covariance matrices

757  $\Sigma_0^{(s)} = \frac{1}{TN^{(s)}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i:\text{stim}(i)=s} (\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)}) (\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)})^T$  and

758  $\Sigma_{+1}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{TN^{(s)}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i:\text{stim}(i)=s} (\mathbf{r}_{t+1}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t+1}^{(s)}) (\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)})^T$ . Then the parameter estimates are:

$$759 \quad \hat{A} = \left( \sum_{s=0}^2 N^{(s)} \Sigma_{+1}^{(s)} \right) \left( \sum_{s=0}^2 N^{(s)} \Sigma_0^{(s)} \right)^{-1} - \mathbb{I} \quad (2)$$

$$760 \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}}_t^{(s)} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)} - (\hat{A} + \mathbb{I}) \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1}^{(s)} \quad (3)$$

$$761 \quad \mathbf{e}_t^{(i)} = (\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_t^{(s)}) - (\hat{A} + \mathbb{I}) (\mathbf{r}_{t-1}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1}^{(s)}) \quad (\text{for } \text{stim}(s) = i), \quad (4)$$

762 where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity matrix. Equation (2) shows that the interaction weights are fully  
 763 determined by the sample covariance of the data, and independent of the mean profile.  
 764 Conversely, given this matrix, the stimulus-related inputs depend only on the mean response  
 765 profile (Equation 3). Finally, Equation (4) indicates that the residuals  $\mathbf{e}_t^{(i)}$  capture the  
 766 deviation from the mean profile that remains unexplained by the estimated interaction matrix  
 767 and the measured initial state  $\mathbf{r}_0^{(i)}$ .

768 In practice, we fit the MVAR model using a numerical linear system solver (*mrdivide* in  
 769 MATLAB, Mathworks, Natick MA) applied to the single matrix equation  $\Delta R = \Lambda \Gamma$ , where:

770  $\Delta R$  is the  $N_{\text{neuron}} \times TN$  matrix formed by horizontally concatenating the changes  $\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} -$   
 771  $\mathbf{r}_{t-1}^{(i)}$  for times  $t = 1 \dots T$  over all trials;  $\Gamma$  is the  $(N_{\text{neuron}} + 3NT + 1) \times NT$  matrix formed

772 by vertically concatenating matrices  $R, J^{(0)}, J^{(1)}, J^{(2)}$  and  $V$ , with  $R$  formed from the measured

773 responses  $\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)}$  for  $t = 0 \dots T - 1$  over all trials,  $J^{(s)}$  containing a  $T \times T$  identity matrix for

774 each trial with stimulus  $s$  and 0s elsewhere, and  $V$  formed from the running speeds  $v_t^{(i)}$  for

times  $t = 1 \dots T$  over all trials; and finally  $\Lambda$  concatenates the parameters to be estimated:  
 $\Lambda = [A, \mathbf{u}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T^{(0)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_T^{(2)}, \xi]$ . We first fit separate models using either  
the pre- or post-learning data for each individual mouse. We then modeled pre- and post-  
learning data jointly, while constraining a subset of the parameters to remain fixed  
(**Supplementary Fig. 11e**). Specifically, for each mouse we concatenated pre- and post-  
learning trials to form the matrix  $\Delta R = [\Delta R_{\text{pre}}, \Delta R_{\text{post}}]$ . The construction of  $\Gamma$  then  
determined which parameters were held fixed over learning. When  
 $\Gamma = [R_{\text{pre}}, 0; 0, R_{\text{post}}; J_{\text{pre}}, 0; 0, J_{\text{post}}; V_{\text{pre}}, 0; 0, V_{\text{post}}]$  (with semicolons representing vertical  
concatenation and  $J = [J^{(0)}; J^{(1)}; J^{(2)}]$ ) no parameters are constrained and this method  
becomes equivalent to fitting the model separately pre- and post-learning. When  $\Gamma =$   
 $[R_{\text{pre}}, R_{\text{post}}; J_{\text{pre}}, J_{\text{post}}; V_{\text{pre}}, V_{\text{post}}]$ , all parameters are constrained and this method becomes  
equivalent to fitting a single model to capture activity both before and after learning. Partial  
constraints fall between these extremes. For example, to fix all interaction weights over  
learning while allowing all stimulus-related inputs to change, we set  
 $\Gamma = [R_{\text{pre}}, R_{\text{post}}; J_{\text{pre}}, 0; 0, J_{\text{post}}; V_{\text{pre}}, V_{\text{post}}]$  whereas to allow interactions to change while  
keeping stimulus-related inputs fixed we set  $\Gamma = [R_{\text{pre}}, 0; 0, R_{\text{post}}; J_{\text{pre}}, J_{\text{post}}; V_{\text{pre}}, V_{\text{post}}]$ . In  
all such models, we held the velocity modulation coefficients fixed over learning.

We tested the performance of the MVAR model using leave-one-out cross validation  
(**Supplementary Fig. 10b, c**), measuring prediction quality on held-out data. We held out one  
vertical grating trial in the test set, using the remaining trials of all types for training. The  
MVAR model was fit to these training data, and the error in the model prediction was  
calculated for each time sample in the test trial. This procedure was repeated  $N^{(1)}$  times,  
leaving out each vertical grating trial in turn. An  $R^2$  value for each cell was then calculated  
combining errors across all of these trials. To ease comparison with alternative models,  
running speed was not included in the model for the cross-validation analysis.

We benchmarked the MVAR model against three alternative models using this cross-  
validation method. In the response profile only model, the predicted activity of each cell was  
given by its average response profile over the training data for the vertical grating stimulus.  
This is equivalent to an MVAR model with all elements of the interaction matrix set to zero.  
The second alternative was equivalent to the MVAR model with off-diagonal elements of the  
interaction weight matrix set to zero. This model therefore incorporates autocorrelations and  
fluctuations in baseline from trial to trial, but not any additional cross-correlations between

cells. This model was fit by subtracting the average response profile from each cell, and then regressing the resulting signal for each cell against its own activity at the previous time step, to obtain a single regression weight for each cell. The third model was equivalent to the MVAR model with interaction weights that vary with time relative to stimulus onset. To fit this model, we subtracted the average response profile and regressed the activity of the population against the activity of the population at the previous time step. This regression was done separately for each time sample relative to stimulus onset to obtain a full interaction weight matrix for each time sample.

To analyze the contribution of neuronal interactions and stimulus-related inputs to the measured responses we derived analytical expressions for the responses produced by the model under a given set of parameters:

$$\mathbf{r}_t^{(i)} = (A + \mathbb{I})^t \mathbf{r}_0^{(i)} + \sum_{\tau=1}^t (A + \mathbb{I})^{t-\tau} (\mathbf{u}_\tau^{(s)} + \xi v_\tau^{(i)} + \mathbf{e}_\tau^{(i)}) \quad (5)$$

Using this equation, we computed the population responses when weights were deleted (set to zero) and when residuals were shuffled (**Fig. 4c, d**). In the model, the interaction weights are a function of only the covariance of the data (see Equation 2) and the residuals contain any variability not captured by the model.

We derived analytical expressions for the covariance between cells generated by the model. For simplicity, we omitted the running speed term and assumed that residuals were stationary and lacked intertemporal covariance, and that residuals did not covary with the initial state, i.e.,  $\langle \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_{t-\tau}^T \rangle = \delta_{t,t-\tau} \Sigma_{\mathbf{e}}$  and  $\langle \mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{r}_0^T \rangle = 0$  where angle brackets represent expectations over trials,  $\delta_{t,t'}$  is the Kronecker delta, and  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{e}}$  is the covariance matrix of the residuals. Then from Equation (5) it follows that the response covariance between cells at time  $t$  is given by

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{r}_t} = (A + \mathbb{I})^t \Sigma_{\mathbf{r}_0} (A^T + \mathbb{I})^t + \sum_{\tau=1}^t (A + \mathbb{I})^{t-\tau} \Sigma_{\mathbf{e}} (A^T + \mathbb{I})^{t-\tau} \quad (6)$$

From this expression it can be seen that covariance between the responses of cells can only be generated by off-diagonal elements of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{r}_0}$ ,  $A$ , or  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{e}}$ . By shuffling residuals, we remove off-diagonal elements of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{e}}$ . By deleting weights between cells, we remove off-diagonal elements of  $A$ . Thus, the degree to which the observed covariance was accounted for by correlations in the residuals was assessed by simulating the responses after shuffling the residuals. To determine the degree to which the observed covariance was accounted for by interaction weights, we simulated responses after deleting the interaction weights. These manipulations allowed us to test whether the model captured the coordinated variability in the data using a

set of parameters fixed across trials, without requiring any additional unexplained inputs that covary across trials or time.

To shuffle residuals in **Fig. 4c, d**, we randomly permuted the trial labels of the residuals across all vertical stimulus trials separately for each cell and then computed the responses according to Equation (2) by substituting the shuffled residuals. Having calculated the responses under residual shuffling, we then computed pairwise noise correlations using the same method as for the experimental data. We repeated this for 100 random shuffles and averaged over the noise correlations generated by these shuffles for each cell pair. To calculate the noise correlations when interactions are removed (**Fig. 4c, d**), we set all off-diagonal elements of the interaction matrix  $A$  to zero and then computed the responses according to Equation (2). We again calculated the noise correlations of these responses as above. To quantify the quality of the fit after shuffling residuals and removing interactions we computed  $R^2$  of the noise correlations of the data compared to model under the relevant manipulation.

To compute the selectivity of responses following weight deletions we set either all or specific off-diagonal weights of a given type to zero (leaving diagonal elements of the weight matrix intact), calculated responses as above, and averaged responses for each cell to the vertical and angled stimulus similar to the experimental data. Because the interaction weights in the MVAR model organize to best capture the variance in the data (see above), deleting weights removes the majority of simulated response variance. We therefore used the measured variance to calculate selectivity after weight deletions. To determine whether the effect of weight deletion changed with learning, we computed both pre- and post-learning, the selectivity index with all weights intact,  $SI_{full}$ , and the selectivity with specific weights deleted,  $SI_{del}$ , and then compared  $|SI_{del,pre}| - |SI_{full,pre}|$  to  $|SI_{del,post}| - |SI_{full,post}|$  using a sign test.

To test whether interaction weights identified by the model were dependent on the stimulus-related input preference of the cell (**Fig. 4j, Supplementary Fig. 11c, d**), we separated cell pairs into groups according to the mean stimulus-related input they received in the 0 to 1 s window from stimulus onset at the vertical and angled gratings. If both cells in the pair had a larger stimulus-related input for the same grating, they were considered to have the same grating preference (either to the vertical or angled stimulus), otherwise they were considered to have opposite preferences. We measured the mean interaction weight between cell pairs that preferred the same or different gratings. Only cells whose responses were significantly

different to the vertical and angled gratings were included in the analysis (criterion  $P < 0.05$ , Wilcoxon rank-sum test).

To test how well the changes in selectivity were captured by the model with a given set of parameters fixed, we shuffled the trial labels of the residuals across the combined set of pre- and post-learning trials which removed any response changes not captured by the model (leaving the residuals across cells and time within a given trial intact). We then recomputed the responses using Equation (2) by substituting the shuffled residuals, and computed the selectivity of these responses pre- and post-learning. We repeated this process for 100 random shuffles and averaged the resulting selectivity over shuffles. We then computed the  $R^2$  value of the model-generated change in selectivity vs the change in selectivity observed in the data. To generate confidence intervals for these  $R^2$  values we performed a bootstrap over cells.

To perform hypothesis testing that two models (Model 1 and Model 2) generated  $R^2$  values that differed more than would be expected by chance, we performed a model-based bootstrap (see legend of **Supplementary Fig.11c**). For the model-based bootstrap, we first fit the data to Model 1. We then generated a new dataset from Model 1 by randomly resampling residuals (with replacement) and computing responses according to Equation (2). Next, we fit Models 1 and 2 to the dataset generated from Model 1, and computed the  $R^2$  of the change in selectivity generated by these models against the change in selectivity in the simulated dataset from Model 1. We repeated this process 500 times to obtain a distribution of the difference in  $R^2$  between Model 1 and Model 2 that would be expected if the data were generated by Model 1.

### *Statistics*

Data are reported as mean  $\pm$  SEM or as mean  $\pm$  STD as indicated. All data analyses were performed using custom code written in Matlab. No assumptions of normality of data distributions were imposed. The non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum test and sign test were used to study differences between two groups of unpaired and paired data respectively. Bonferroni correction was applied for multiple comparisons as indicated. No test for equal variance was performed. Bootstrap tests were performed as indicated. Multilevel analysis was performed in some cases to account for nested experimental design. No statistical methods were used to pre-determine sample sizes, but our sample sizes are similar to those in prior reports and are typical for the field. All statistical tests were two-sided, and  $P$ -values  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significant. No randomization or blinding was performed during experiments or data analysis.

904 *Life Sciences Reporting Summary*

905 Further information on experimental design is available in the Life Sciences Reporting  
906 Summary.

907

908 *Data and code availability*

909 The data and code that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding  
910 authors upon reasonable request.

911 **Methods References**

912 51. Hu, H., Cavendish, J. Z. & Agmon, A. Not all that glitters is gold: off-target recombination in the  
913 somatostatin-IRES-Cre mouse line labels a subset of fast-spiking interneurons. *Front. Neural*  
914 *Circuits* **7**, 195 (2013).

915



## Figure legends

**Figure 1.** Simultaneous two-photon imaging of multiple cell classes during a visual discrimination task in virtual reality. **(a)** Virtual reality setup. **(b)** Schematic of behavioral task. Mice were rewarded for licking a reward spout when presented with vertical and not angled gratings. **(c)** Behavioral discrimination performance (behavioral  $d'$ ) across learning ( $N = 8$  mice). Connected points represent individual mice. **(d)** Top, example region of an in-vivo image plane with GCaMP6f expressing neurons. Bottom, same region after post-hoc immunostaining for PV, SOM and VIP (orange, blue and magenta, respectively) and image registration to match the in-vivo plane. Identified interneurons are indicated by arrowheads. Image registration and cell matching was performed for each mouse ( $N=8$ ) **(e)** Top, average responses to the vertical grating of all recorded neurons of each cell type after learning. Calcium responses are baseline corrected (subtraction of baseline  $\Delta F/F$  -0.5 to 0 s before stimulus onset), and aligned to grating onset (dashed line). Cells are sorted by their average response amplitude 0-1 s from stimulus onset. Number of cells included in each plot: 1249, 132, 58 and 175 for PYR, PV, SOM and VIP, respectively,  $N = 8$  mice. Bottom, average responses of cells from the top, middle and bottom 10th percentiles of grating-evoked response amplitudes of each cell class (125, 13, 6 and 18 cells in each 10th percentile, respectively). Shaded area represents SEM. **(f)** Average response to the vertical grating of all cells from each cell class after learning. **(g)** Similarity of response profiles to the vertical grating of all pairs of cell classes attained with a random forest decoder to classify single cells to one of two classes based on the shape of their average baseline-subtracted response profiles (see Online Methods). Response profile similarity score =  $2 \times (1 - \text{classification accuracy})$ . Scores near 0 and 1 indicate low and high response profile similarity between two cell classes respectively.

**Figure 2.** Response amplitude and stimulus selectivity changes with learning in different cell classes. **(a)** Average responses to vertical (blue line) and angled (red line) grating stimuli before (dashed line) and after learning (solid line) of example neurons from different cell classes. Numbers indicate selectivity to the grating stimuli, calculated in a window 0-1s from grating stimulus onset (gray shading). Positive and negative values indicate vertical and angled preference, respectively. Shaded area represents SEM. **(b)** Grating selectivity of the same cells (rows) before (pre) and after (post) learning (columns). Cells were ordered by their mean pre- and post-learning selectivity. Numbers of cells recorded both pre- and post-learning: 1249 PYR, 132 PV, 58 SOM and 175 VIP cells here and in c,d,f,g and h,  $N = 8$  mice. **(c)** Percentage of cells in each cell class which displayed a significant increase, decrease or no change in selectivity during learning (bootstrap test,  $P < 0.05$ ). **(d)** Mean absolute selectivity of each cell class before and after learning. Error bars represent SEM here and elsewhere. Sign test, \*\*,  $P < 0.001$ ; \*,  $P < 0.05$  (PYR,  $P < 10^{-7}$ ; PV,  $P = 0.002$ ; SOM,  $P = 0.51$ ; VIP,  $P = 1$ ). Data distribution shown in **Supplementary Fig. 5a**. **(e)** Relationship between action potential firing rate and calcium transient size in simultaneous loose patch and GCaMP6f recordings from the three interneuron classes in visual cortex slices (13 PV, 17 SOM and 11 VIP cells). **(f)** Comparison of selectivity values computed from measured fluorescence (x-axis) and inferred firing rate (y-axis) in PV, SOM, and VIP interneurons. Pearson correlation coefficients 1.00, 0.99, 0.97 for PV, SOM and VIP respectively **(g, h)** Relationship between the selectivity of individual PV cells **(g)** or SOM cells **(h)** and the mean selectivity of the local PYR population within 100  $\mu\text{m}$  distance from each PV or SOM cell, before (top) and after learning (bottom). Exact  $P$  values are reported only for  $P > 0.001$ .

**Figure 3.** Changes in neuronal co-fluctuations with learning. **(a)** Example responses of simultaneously imaged neurons before (left) and after learning (right). Colored bars on top indicate stimuli encountered by the mouse as it traversed the virtual corridor: blue and red indicate vertical and angled gratings, gray and white indicate corridor walls in gray or with dots, respectively. Running (black line), reward delivery (red triangle) and licks (crosses) are indicated below. **(b)** Example matrices of noise correlations measured during the vertical grating response (0-1 s from stimulus onset) between cell pairs of the same neurons imaged before (left) and after learning (right). Only a quarter of the recorded PYR cells are shown in **a** and **b** for clarity. **(c)** Average noise correlations between cell pairs for each combination of cell classes, before and after learning. Only cells with significant responses to the grating stimuli were included. The number of cell pairs in each cell class combination (pre, post-learning) was: PYR-PYR 77599, 66633, VIP-VIP 984, 776, SOM-SOM 201, 131, PV-PV 1646, 1316, PV-VIP 818, 702, PV-PYR 17496, 15029, PYR-VIP 14485, 11893, SOM-PV 1176, 828, SOM-PYR 7121, 5545, SOM-VIP 476, 364. Error bars represent SEM. Full data distribution can be seen in **Supplementary Fig. 7b**. **(d)** Relative changes in noise correlation (shown in **c**) over learning between and within all cell classes, as indicated by line thickness and color code. Shorter line segments show relative change in correlations between cells of the same type.

**Figure 4.** A multivariate autoregressive (MVAR) linear dynamical system model indicates emergence of specific PYR-PV interactions with learning. **(a)** An MVAR model fits single trial responses by estimating the contribution of stimulus-locked input, recurrent inputs from the local cell population and running speed. **(b)** Example traces of responses and model fit on three single trials (columns) from 4 cells (rows) along with each cell's stimulus input (blue) and average recurrent input (red). **(c)** Average post-learning noise correlations between all cell pairs, observed (gray), or simulated after deleting interaction weights (orange) or shuffling residuals (white). Error bars represent SEM here and below. **(d)** Scatter density plot of observed versus simulated pairwise noise correlations (NC), after deleting interaction weights or shuffling residuals.  $N = 103217$  cell pairs. **(e, f)** Effect on selectivity of deleting all interaction weights in the MVAR model onto PV (top) or SOM cells (bottom) before **(e)** and after **(f)** learning. Bars indicate average absolute selectivity with weights intact and deleted. Sign test, \*\*,  $P < 10^{-3}$ ; \*,  $P < 0.05$  here and below.  $N = 1249$  PYR, 132 PV and 58 SOM cells here and below. **(g, h, i)** Effect of deleting specific interaction weights ( $\Delta$ selectivity) onto PV **(g)**, SOM **(h)** and PYR cells **(i)** on their selectivity pre- and post-learning. \* with horizontal line indicates pre-post learning comparison, \* at base of bar indicates significant difference between intact and deleted weights, pre- or post-learning. Data distribution shown in **Supplementary Fig. 11b**. **(j)** Interaction weights in MVAR model before and after learning for cell pairs with the same or opposite stimulus-input preference.  $N$  interaction weights pre- and post-learning for same or opposite preference pairs, PYR-PYR pre 20074, 16750 post 41548, 38056, PYR-PV pre 2132, 1513, post 4856, 4300. Data distribution shown in **Supplementary Fig. 11d**. **(k)** Schematic depicting how PYR to PV interaction weights (arrows of different thickness) rearrange to provide selective inputs to PV cells after learning.

**Figure 5.** Degree of coupling with the SOM cell population before learning is related to PYR cell selectivity increase. **(a)** Centre: distribution of pre-learning noise correlations between individual PYR cells and the average activity of the SOM cell population,  $N = 1249$  PYR cells. Vertical dashed lines denote top and bottom 20th percentiles. Left and right: 4 example cells each showing average grating responses pre- and post-learning of representative PYR cells with low (left) and high (right) pre-learning SOM cell population coupling. Numbers

1017 above traces indicate selectivity. **(b, c)** Difference in the absolute selectivity pre- and post-  
1018 learning ( $\Delta$ selectivity) of PYR cells **(b)** and PV cells **(c)** with low and high (bottom and top  
1019 20<sup>th</sup> percentiles) coupling to the four cell populations. Wilcoxon rank-sum test, \*\*,  $P = 0.001$ ,  
1020  $N = 250$  PYR cells **(b)** and 26 PV cells **(c)** in each group. Error bars represent SEM.  
1021









